

Michael Singleton, # 344630,)
f.k.a Michael A. Singleton # 1081861, f/k/a)
Michael A. Singleton # 63483, a/k/a Justice) C/A No.: 2:11-676-TLW-BHH
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) ORDER
)
Warden Bernard McKie a/k/a Warden Mackey;)
Mr. William Byers; Ms. Lighsner; Mr. D. Wesley;)
and Dr. John Doe,)
)
Defendants.)
)

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

1

Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 83); Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 85); Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 43); and Plaintiff's "motion for summary judgment and request for discovery" is **DENIED**. (Doc. # 49). Defendants Mr. William Byers, Ms. Lighsner, Mr. D. Wesley, and Dr. John Doe are **DISMISSED** without prejudice, and this case is to be closed.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

TERRY L. WOOTEN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 29, 2012

Florence, South Carolina

¹As noted in the Report, these four additional Defendants appear on the docket. However, in light of Magistrate Judge Hendricks' ruling on the Motion to Amend/Correct Complaint (see Docs. # 35 & #36), and the undersigned's Order of October 24, 2011 (Doc. #47), the Court determines that, as recommended, these four Defendants should be dismissed at this time, without prejudice.